



Legislative Bulletin.....June 29, 2005

Contents:

H.R. 3058 —Amendments to the FY06 Treasury, Transportation/Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill, **Part I**

H.R. 3058, the FY06 Amendments to the FY06 Treasury, Transportation/Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Bill, is scheduled to be considered on the House floor on Wednesday, June 29th, subject to an open rule (H. Res. 342). Below are the summaries of amendments preprinted under the open rule. Note: Summaries are based on RSC staff's review of actual amendment text. For a summary of the underlying bill, see the separate RSC Policy Brief distributed earlier.

Gingrey (R-GA) #1: Prohibits available funds from being used “to provide assistance under the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) for any private economic development project (including assistance for any project under paragraph (17) of section 105(a) of such Act) involving the obtaining of property by the exercise of the power of eminent domain.”

According to the sponsor, the amendment “would restrict CDBG funds from being disbursed specifically to economic development projects that use eminent domain to obtain the property being developed. This amendment cites paragraph (17) of section 105(a) of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) as one guideline for what constitutes an "economic development project" and thereby disallows CDBG funding to only those projects which involve the transfer of one's private property to another private entity for purposes of economic development and obtained by means of eminent domain.”

Gingrey (R-GA) #5: The amendment decreases and increases by \$10 million, the total amount appropriated to the Community Development fund.

According to the sponsor, “The purpose of this amendment would be to provide an opportunity to discuss the responsibilities of government with respect to the power of eminent domain the context of the recent *New London* decision by the Supreme Court.”

Hefley (R-CA) #7: Reduces funding in the Act by \$669,350,000. This amount is equal to one percent of the total amount of discretionary funding in the bill.

Nadler/Velázquez/Frank (D-NY/D-MA) #11: Amendment text was not available. According to the sponsor, “the amendment would increase funding for Section 8 vouchers by \$100 million and reduce funding for the working capital fund from the HUD management and administration account and other administrative expenses.”

Shuster (R-PA) #13: Reduces by \$2 million, funds available for GSA’s Operating Expenses (from \$99.89 million to \$97.89 million), and increases by \$2 million, funds available Federal Buildings Fund’s Glass Fragmentation Program (from \$15.7 million to \$17.7 million).

According to the sponsor, he intends to “take the \$2 million from the Administrator's Office and the Congressional Affairs’ Office. GSA has submitted its Capital Investment and Leasing Program to Congress later and later each year. Congress used to receive it in February or March. Last year part of it arrived in May and the final portion arrived in September. This year it came in May and June and additional prospectuses are expected later in the year. The amendment ensures that the \$2 million continues to be used for public buildings purposes and not moved to some other program.”

Simmons (R-CT) #14: Prohibits available funds from being “used to enter into, implement, or provide oversight of contracts between the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, and private collection agencies. Notwithstanding this provision, the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, may continue to utilize any private collection contract authority in effect prior to October 22, 2004. Nothing in this provision shall impact the administration of any tax or tariff.” Additionally, the amendment reduces by \$5 million, funds available for the Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization.

According to the sponsor, “The amendment would prohibit funds that would allow the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, to outsource tax collection.” Additionally, the sponsor states the amendment is likely subject to a point of order.

Simmons (R-CT) #15: Prohibits available funds from being used “used to make taxpayer identification numbers (TINs) or social security numbers available to private collection agencies for the purpose of collecting taxes.”

According to the sponsor, “The amendment would prohibit funds that would allow the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, to outsource tax collection,” and the sponsor intends to offer this amendment if the previous amendment is subject to a point of order.

Gingrey (R-GA) #2: Prohibits “funds made available in this Act for the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) may be used to provide assistance

under paragraph (17) of section 105(a) of such Act for any economic development project involving the obtaining of property by the exercise of the power of domain.”

The sponsor intends for the amendment to “restrict CDBG funds from being disbursed specifically to economic development projects that use eminent domain to obtain the property being developed. The amendment strikes the term "economic development project" and exclusively defines those prohibited activities in terms of paragraph (17) of section 105(a).”

Al Green (D-X) #3: Reduces by \$7.7 million, funds available for the Office of Lead Hazard Control, Management and Administration (from \$1.152 billion to \$1.144 billion) and increases by \$7.7 million, funds available for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Fair Housing Activities (from \$38.8 million to \$46.5 million).

According to the sponsor, the amendment “would restore funding for HUD-funded fair housing activities to the amount passed in the FY 2005 VA-HUD appropriations bill. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the amendment will have a net effect of zero on budget authority and a reduction of \$6 million in outlays.” Additionally, the sponsor stated the offset may be changed to come from the IRS Information Systems and Telecommunications Support Account, which receives \$1.6 billion.

Maloney (D-NY) #8: Increases by \$2.25 million (from \$750,000 to \$3 million) the available funds for the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board under the Executive Office of the President.

The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board was created by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (Public Law 108-458). According to the sponsor, “since the President made the request of \$750,000, there has been concern that this was not an adequate funding level for a board charged with monitoring civil liberties and privacy government-wide. The additional funding will allow the board to develop the infrastructure they need to do their job and will send a message that Congress fully intends to support this important board.”

Souder (R-IN) #17: Increases by \$25 million (from \$120 million to \$145 million) the available funds to support a national media campaign under a national anti-drug campaign for youth (authorized by the Drug Free Media Campaign Act of 1998); reduces by \$25 million (from \$708.1 million to \$683.1 million) the available funds for the GSA Real Property Activities Fund - Federal Buildings Fund.

In title VI, in the item relating to “FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS—OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS”, after each of the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: “(increased by \$25,000,000)”.

In title VII, in the item relating to “GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES —FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND”—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount preceding paragraph (1), insert the following: “(reduced by \$25,000,000)”;

and (2) after each of the dollar amounts in paragraphs (4) and (5), insert the following: “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Brown (D-FL): Would strike the following section of the bill under National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak): “that none of the funds herein shall be available for the operation and maintenance of routes RT16A, RT18, RT19, RT22, RT25, RT26, RT27, RT28, RT30, RT32, RT33, RT34, RT45, RT48, RT52, RT54, RT63, RT66, as in existence on May 1, 2005.” Thus, the amendment would lift the restriction on the use of funds for these Amtrak routes. According to the sponsor, the amendment would strike language in the bill which eliminates funding for grants that go to Amtrak routes requiring more than \$30 per passenger in Federal grant subsidies.

Kilpatrick (D-MI): Prohibits available funds from being used by the Department of Treasury to “recommend approval of the sale of Unocal Corporation to CNOOC Ltd. of China (National Offshore Oil Corporation).”

According to the sponsor, “China has had ample access to the U.S. market. Chinese companies have acquired IBM’s personal computer sector; placed a bid for Maytag; purchased Treasury bonds, which have financed the deficits we have generated over the last 4 years; and it has dumped its clothing and textiles in the U.S. market place, forcing thousands of clothing and textile workers out of jobs.”

Davis (D-FL) #4: Prohibits available funds from being used to “to implement, administer, or enforce the amendments made to section 515.560 or 515.561 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to travel-related transactions incident to travel to Cuba and visiting relatives in Cuba), as published in the Federal Register on June 16, 2004. (b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to the implementation, administration, or enforcement of section 515.560(c)(3) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.”

On June 30, 2004, the Department of Treasury implemented new restrictions on family travel to Cuba. An identical amendment was offered on the Transportation/Treasury Appropriations FY05 bill, passed by a vote of 225 to 174, but was stripped in Conference.

According to the sponsor, “this ‘get-tough’ initiative to rid Cuba of Fidel Castro punishes Cubans on both sides of the Florida straits and will have a minimal effect on the government of Cuba. Specifically, the new Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) rules limit family visits to Cuba to one trip every three years for a maximum of 14 days under a specific license to visit only immediate family. Under this new policy, emergency visits will no longer be allowed nor will any visits to aunts, uncles and cousins in Cuba. The previous policy allowed Cuban-Americans one trip per year under a general license for an unspecified number of days, included a broader definition of family and allowed emergency visits under a specific license. The newest collection of misguided regulations jeopardizes countless innocent Cubans who depend on visits from their Cuban-American relatives not only for moral support but also for the delivery of food, medicine, clothing and money. These sweeping changes were done without as much as one hearing in Congress.”

###

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.